### SUPREME COURT MINUTES FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 2007 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

### S042660

### PEOPLE v. DEMENT (RONNIE

Extension of time granted. Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy State Public Defender William T. Lowe's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's reply brief after July 2007, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 9, 2007. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 200 additional days are contemplated.

### S048763

## PEOPLE v. NELSON (SERGIO D )

Extension of time granted. Good cause appearing, and based upon Senior Deputy State Public Defender Joseph E. Chabot's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's reply brief by January 7, 2008, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 6, 2007. After that date, only five further extensions totaling about 300 additional days will be granted.

### S067392

# PEOPLE v. FREDERICKSON (DANIEL C.)

Extension of time granted. Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy State Public Defender Douglas Ward's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by August 2007, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 5, 2007. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 150 additional days will be granted.

### S072161

### **PEOPLE v. POTTS (THOMAS)**

Extension of time granted. Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Michael P. Goldstein's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by May 14, 2007, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 6, 2007. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 69 additional days will be granted.

### S139510

### **VELASQUEZ (RONALD) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted. On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to January 31, 2007.

### S140061

### TOVAR (RUBEN) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted. On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and the file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to January 29, 2007.

### S140337

### **DOMINGUEZ (VICENTE) ON**

Extension of time granted. On application of the Attorney General and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response is hereby extended to January 22, 2007.

### S140417

## VILLALOBOS (ABRAHAM) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted. On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to the informal response is hereby extended to January 26, 2007.

### S141627

### **CRAVER (ANTHONY) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted. On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to the informal response is hereby extended to January 19, 2007.

### S142071

### **GOMEZ (ANTHONY) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted. On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to January 29, 2007.

### S143304

### **HOLDER (RODNEY G.) ON H.C.**

Extension of time granted. On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to January 26, 2007.

**S147999** A110449/A110463/A110450/A110451/A110651/A110652 First Appellate District, Div. 3 **MARRIAGE CASES, IN RE** 

Extension of time granted. On application of the City and County of San Francisco, it is ordered that the time to serve and file its opening brief on the merits is extended to March 19, 2007. In light of this request, the time is also extended to March 19, 2007, for other parties to file their opening briefs on the merits. No further extensions of time to file the opening briefs on the merits are contemplated. In response to the request of the City and County of San Francisco for clarification of this court's December 20, 2006, order granting review in these cases, the order should be interpreted as granting review in all of the cases and on all of the issues addressed by the Court of Appeal in its decision in this coordinated matter. Petitioners and intervenor in the cases of *CCSF v. State, Woo v. State, Clinton v. State,* and *Tyler v. State* may address in their opening briefs on the merits the issues related to whether the marriage statutes violate the California Constitution. Petitioners in the cases of *Proposition 22 Legal Defense and Education Fund v. CCSF* and *Campaign for California Families v. Newsom* may address in their opening briefs on the merits the issue of justiciability or standing addressed by the Court of Appeal.

### S120980

MONTERROSO (CHRISTIAN) ON H.C.

Order filed. Pursuant to petitioner's request filed on January 4, 2007, petitioner's exhibits, nos. 199 and 259 are ordered withdrawn.

**S145571** B182104/B184549/B184127

Second Appellate District, Div. 1

SANTA MONICA, CITY OF v. GONZALEZ (GUILLERMO)

Order filed. On December 1, 2006, David J. Pasternak, the appointed receiver in the above-captioned matter, submitted a brief to this court responding to the opening brief on the merits of petitioner Guillermo Gonzalez. The receiver is deemed a respondent in this matter, and the submitted brief is deemed an answer brief on the merits. Good cause appearing, relief from default for the late submission of this brief otherwise due on November 13, 2006, (see Cal. Rules of Court, rules 8.60(d), 8.520(a)(2), former rules 29.1(a)(2), 45(e)), is ordered on the court's own motion. The brief is ordered filed, nunc pro tunc, as of December 1, 2006. Petitioner may file a single reply brief on the merits, addressing all answer briefs, within 20 days after respondent City of Santa Monica files its answer brief on the merits.

### S128999

### **DUGGAN ON DISCIPLINE**

Probation revoked. Good cause having been shown, it is hereby ordered that probation is revoked, the previously ordered stay of execution of suspension in the above entitled matter is lifted, and DEBORAH ANN DUGGAN, State Bar No. 113112, must be actually suspended from the practice of law for three years and until she provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Credit toward the period of actual suspension will be given for the period of involuntary inactive enrollment which commenced on October 15, 2006, (Business and Professions Code section 6007(d)(3)). Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

### S132789

### **ALLEGRINO ON DISCIPLINE**

Probation modified. It is ordered that the probation previously ordered in S132789 (State Bar Court case nos. 02-O-13815; 02-O-13919; 03-O-00065) be modified as follows:

- 1. Respondent is to make restitution to Daniel Neil Talcott (or the Client Security Fund if it has paid) in the amount of \$940.78 together with 10 percent interest thereon per annum from June 9, 2003, until paid and to provide satisfactory proof thereof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles no later than December 31, 2007. (See additional conditions under probation condition number 12.)
- 2. Respondent is to make restitution to Mahesh Mathur (or the Client Security Fund if it has paid) in the amount of \$15,359.51 together with 7 percent interest thereon per annum from August 5, 2004, until paid in the manner specified below and to provide satisfactory proof thereof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles no later than December 31, 2009. Respondent is to pay Mathur at least \$5,200 no later than December 31, 2007; at least an additional \$5,200 no later than December 31, 2008; and the remaining amount no later than December 31, 2009.
- 3. With each of his quarterly probation reports, respondent is to provide the Office of Probation with satisfactory proof of his restitution payments to Talcott and Mathur during the preceding calendar quarter.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

#### S148623

FORD (ISAAC) v. S.C.

The application of petitioner for leave to file Petition for Writ of Mandate is hereby denied.

S148624

FORD (ISAAC) v. S.C. (OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL)

The application of petitioner for leave to file Petition for Writ of Mandate is hereby denied.

S148626

FORD (ISAAC) v. S.C. (SYKES)

The application of petitioner for leave to file Petition for Writ of Mandate is hereby denied.

**S148749** B184034

B184034 Second Appellate District, Div. 5

LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF v. CALIFORNIA STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL

### **BOARD**

The application of respondent Natural Resources Defense Council for permission to file one consolidated answer to petitions for review is hereby granted.

B186116 Second Appellate District, Div. 7

AUERBACH ACQUISITION ASSOCIATES, INC. v. DAILY (GREG)

The above-entitle matter, no pending in the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, is transferred from Division Seven to Division One.

B186727

Second Appellate District, Div. 2

LANEY (STEPHANIE) v. LEVITON MANUFACTURING CO., INC.

The above-entitle matter, no pending in the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, is transferred from Division Two to Division Three.

B179387/B189213

Second Appellate District, Div. 1 **ORTHOTEC, LLC v.** 

**EUROSURGICAL, SA** 

The above-entitle matter, no pending in the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, is transferred from Division One to Division Seven.

B191661

Second Appellate District, Div. 3

GREENBERG (MICHAEL JAMES) v. CITY OF LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE

The above-entitle matter, no pending in the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, is transferred from Division Three to Division Two.